

as I think it plain, he has neglected to seek the local remedies provided for all such cases. I do not wish to advise how he can set up claims of foreign protection.

I cannot conceive that there is in the Civil Code any provision violating our treaty stipulations in regard to auctioneers. Mr. Waterhouse desired an auctioneer's license, but could not succeed in his application, not only because he was an alien resident, but, as I am informed, because the full number of auction licenses for Oahu had been either promised or already issued.

Without remarking on what I consider a just basis of public policy, I will observe that, in my opinion, he can find no fair ground to claim the privilege of an auctioneer upon the second articles of the British and French treaties. Would he maintain the right to own and sail merchant vessels under the Hawaiian flag because Hawaiian subjects are entitled to it?

More than this—does the general designation of "trade, by wholesale or retail," as used in the treaties, in the common usage of language, embrace the business of auctioneers? It is clearly otherwise. In most countries, it has been thought necessary to subject auctioneers to special license and place them under the surveillance of the police authorities. They are, properly speaking, government agents, appointed not to act as traders, but to protect the interests of both sellers and buyers against improper influences and combinations.

But this is a subject which concerns the exposition of treaties, and I therefore leave to your own hands, where it properly belongs—in your own hands.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,  
Your obedient servant,  
D. L. GREGG.  
His Excellency R. C. WYLLIE,  
Minister of Foreign Relations, &c., &c., &c.

[The following is the letter referred to in Mr. Gregg's preceding dispatch.]

Sir:—In answer to your inquiry of this date, in reference to the assessment of the property of J. T. Waterhouse, Esq., I would beg leave to reply:

1st. Did you call on Mr. Waterhouse for his return?

I left at his place of business, on the corner of Kaahumanu and Queen streets, sometime during the month of August, a blank form addressed to him, a copy of which is herewith enclosed. It contains a request that a return be made of property on 31st August, 1860.

I also enclosed copy of an advertisement published in the *Polynesian* and *Commercial Advertiser*.

On the 7th day of Sept., I made a demand on Mr. Waterhouse personally in Kaahumanu street. He replied that, in his opinion, the appointment of assessors for the present year was not provided for by the law, and did not consider I had any right to act in that capacity.

2d. Was any property out of the Kingdom included in your assessment of his property?

Property within the district of Honolulu alone was included in the assessment.

3d. Did you explain the law or any of its provisions to Mr. Waterhouse?

In conversation with Mr. Waterhouse, he professed to be fully acquainted with the law as myself, and informed me that he had taken legal advice in regard to it. Most respectfully your obedient servant,  
W. H. PRASE.

Honolulu, Jan. 26, 1860.

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Honolulu, 30th Jan., 1860.

Sir:—I had the honor to receive on the 25th instant your dispatch of the same date, together with its enclosure—a complaint from John Thomas Waterhouse, Esquire, one of the most respectable British merchants residing within the King's jurisdiction.

To save time, I immediately passed your pre-cited dispatch and enclosure to Mr. Gregg, to whom the King has confided the management of his taxes and imposts, and their disbursement for the support of his Government, along with the letter of which I enclose a copy.

The Minister of Finance this day placed in my hands the reply, of which I also beg you to enclose copy in *extenso*, because, while eminently courteous to you and to your fellow subject, it exhausts the whole substance of the latter's complaint. It, therefore, only remains for me to add, that I consider generally the views of my colleague, but more especially where he declares his belief that Mr. Waterhouse would be the first to deprecate any measures having the effect of depriving the King's Government of all revenue from internal taxation. In doing Mr. Waterhouse, as distinguished as he is for his loyalty to the King as for his high sense of every other moral and Christian obligation, that justice, Mr. Gregg, doubtless, had in view the last of a series of resolutions presented to both Houses of the Legislature last year by the Chamber of Commerce, which was to the effect that the previous resolutions were not to be understood in a sense contrary to the King's prerogative to raise his revenue in his own way.

Mr. Waterhouse, perhaps, is not aware, as you must be, that your official superior, H. B. M.'s Commissioner and Consul General William Miller, Esquire, for years, included upon this Government's list, and has promulgated the same, the names of the abolition of all Custom House duties on goods imported, and to raise the yearly revenue necessary to support the Government by the sale of Government lands, and by direct taxation. Nor can he be aware of the rule proposed to himself by that absent, but much respected functionary, and consistent with international law and with the declared policy of the British Government, in accordance with which, if Mr. Waterhouse's official complaint had been preferred to him, he would have declined to receive it, till after he had sought redress and, in vain, from the King, as he has for his high sense of the procedure that the Minister of Finance has made as the only proper course. While making this remark, I beseech you not to understand it as in the remotest degree implying the shadow of a censure, for your admitting and passing to me officially the complaint of Mr. Waterhouse, is a duty, and is, in all correct diplomatic, indispensable preliminary. As not only the King's inherent right to impose our recent taxes, but the policy of the Government in imposing them, and the duty of all aliens to pay them, seem to be badly understood by many respectable foreigners residing in this community, I consider that you have rather rendered to the King, and rendered a service than otherwise in having given course to the complaint of Mr. Waterhouse, thereby affording to the Minister of Finance an opportunity of removing, by his lucid and courteous explanations, many existing errors and prejudices.

Further, being desirous to assert to you nothing which I cannot prove, and that no doubt may remain either upon your mind, or that of my respected friend Mr. Waterhouse, as to the course that Mr. Commissioner Miller would have pursued in this case, I take the liberty to enclose, for you to peruse and return, Mr. Nathan's complaint to H. B. M.'s Commissioner of 27th November, 1855, with a whole packet of copies of documents, which your said superior did me the honor to pass to me, on the subject of the decision of the late Chief Justice Lee in the Dower case of Mrs. —, and in which he (the Commissioner) showed, very perspicuously, his reasons for believing that that decision was neither in accordance with our law of Dower, as framed by the late Attorney General Broom, nor with the intention of that law, nor with the sense in which it had been invariably understood by the framers himself, by Mr. Judd and others of his colleagues, and that the decision had vitiated every existing mortgage, and inflicted upon Henry Nathan, Esq., a respectable British merchant (now residing in London) an undoubted loss of \$2,000, besides interest, at the rate of three per cent. per month, from the 16th of July 1851, but nevertheless, informing me, as he did, verbally, that although he had prepared the originals with great pains for transmission to H. B. M.'s Government, on reconsideration he desired from that source, because the counsel for Mr. Nathan, had been so ready to waive the law, and by an appeal from Mr. Lee's decision within the period required by law. The documents in the packet were all

enclosed to Mr. Lee on the 24th April, 1856, and returned by him on the 6th, with written explanations which were sent to General Miller.

In regard to the rate of interest, you will not fail to observe that Commissioner Miller, in his despatch to me of 28th January, 1856, proves that in 1851 a rate of interest even higher than 8 per cent. per month was current, and I add, in proof of M. —'s distress for money, during that year, his Spanish note to me of 1st July, 1851, offering me any rate of interest that I pleased to name for only \$1000 for a short period. Even 5 per cent interest per month was offered me during that year, by large landed proprietors, on the mortgage of their lands.

I expect from your well known sense of justice that you will admit that the above is a case strictly in point, in its application to the complaint of Mr. Waterhouse, to whom the tribunals of the Kingdom have ever been and are now perfectly open, and to whom no more than to any one else is it allowed to *presume*, before trial, that these tribunals will not do them prompt and ample justice.

Without even dreaming that, for one moment, you would question the view of duty taken by your official superior, in the case mentioned, which I understand it, in principle is identical with that of Mr. Waterhouse, as you have the honor provisionally to represent one of the greatest, most enlightened and liberal Governments of the world, I hope you will excuse me for further enclosing a copy of the decision of that Government of the 12th Sept., 1854, on the complaints of Mr. Charlton and other British subjects, in which you will find the following principle laid down by the advice of the late Sir John Dobson, at that time Law Adviser of the Crown:

"After maturely weighing the arguments on both sides, her Majesty's Government are of opinion that whatever motives Messrs. S. — and S. — may have entertained of the possibility of having justice done them in the courts of the islands, they were bound, in the first instance, to submit their case to the tribunals of the islands, and to have neglected or refused to do so, it is not competent for them to get rid of the effect of a decision adverse to their views."

"The deliberative opinion of Sir John Dobson is that if the proceedings of the courts of the Sandwich Islands were to be set aside and H. B. M.'s Government were to authorize their Commissioner to endeavor to do equity between the parties, it must necessarily be attended with very considerable, if not insurmountable difficulties, and could scarcely be attended with any satisfaction to themselves or to H. B. M.'s Government."

The rule then inculcated upon British subjects by their own Government, when our courts were only beginning to be organized, is surely more applicable now that those courts and their decisions may favorably compare with those of the oldest and best organized Governments of the world.

The traditional policy of your great and philanthropic Government towards this Kingdom, is directly opposed to any interference with its courts or laws, unwarranted by international law. As far back as 1843 the British Government declared to the Government of the United States and France, that its policy towards this Kingdom in the following terms:

"Instructions which, during the past year, were addressed by H. B. M.'s Government to the British Consul residing in the Sandwich Islands, and to the naval officers employed on that station, enjoined those officers to treat, on all occasions, the British subjects of the Sandwich Islands with forbearance and courtesy, and to abstain from any interference with the courts of the islands, which, in the absence of British subjects, are to be left to the disposal of the natives. It is the policy of the British Government, in regulating the intercourse of its public servants with the native authorities of the Sandwich Islands, rather to strengthen such authorities by leaving them to the management of their own hands, than to make them feel their dependence upon foreign powers by the exercise of unnecessary interference. It has not been the policy of the British Government to seek to establish a paramount influence in these islands, for Great Britain, at the expense of other powers."

Moreover, at page 385 of my published official correspondence, which I enclose a copy of, you will find a quotation showing that the following rule for British Consuls was inculcated in 1837 by the high authority of Lord Palmerston:

"As a general rule the British Consuls should bear in mind that H. B. M.'s Government are not less anxious than any other Government to protect the interests and property of individuals who are entitled to their protection; but in directing Her Majesty's Consuls abroad to support British interests, Her Majesty's Government are not less anxious to see that the interests of the natives are not sacrificed to the interests of British subjects, and that the law of nations is not violated by the exercise of unnecessary interference."

The Emperors of France and Russia have declared themselves to be the Protectors of independent nationalities; and it is well known to be the opinion of the Right Honorable Lord John Russell that the small States of Italy should be governed by Rulers selected by themselves, and, *a fortiori*, by laws enacted and executed by themselves.

At the risk of being tedious, although as I said before, my colleague had exhausted the subject, I have given the preceding quotations and examples, so as that you and other foreign Commissioners and Consuls presenting to me complaints of their compatriots, on such subjects, may be enabled to see, by the light of the foregoing, that the King's Government is not less anxious to see that the law of nations is not violated by the exercise of unnecessary interference, than it is to see that the interests of British subjects are not sacrificed to the interests of the natives.

Let me add that that ground is not in strict accordance with my official duty under the laws of nations, and with the rule adopted by Commissioner Miller in the case aforesaid, but also with that adopted by H. B. M.'s Government in the case of the French sailor Francois le Flanchet. It is true, M. Perrin, as Commissioner, afterwards made the case diplomatic, but that was expressly on the grounds of an alleged denial of justice, in the King's Court of last appeal—a grave matter, and one which the King's Government would not have considered either in view of their decision, or the evidence adduced, of Hawaiian law, French law, or the law of nations.

I may venture to affirm that the Honorable J. W. Jordan, also a Jurist, and as Diplomatist, like his predecessor, is not likely to make a rule founded on international law and diplomatic usage, and I may say, consistent with his own uniform practice in settling all the great and complex interests committed to his care, with the most scrupulous regard to those interests, chiefly by verbal discussion, exchanging with me official notes only where necessary for the sake of record.

The Minister of Finance leaves it to me to handle the question whether the alleged grievances of Mr. Waterhouse are tenable by our treaty stipulations or not, but giving his opinion that "while foreign residents are not to be placed on a worse footing than His Majesty's subjects, there can be no greater danger of a successful issue on that point against the Hawaiian Government." In becoming the King's Minister of Finance Mr. Gregg has not lost his high attainments as a Jurist and Diplomatist, and therefore, on the ground of *analogia* alone, I should be inclined to bow to his judgment, and to acquiesce in the course he has taken, referred to, that the rights of all alien residents in this Kingdom are measured by the rights enjoyed by the King's native subjects, with the exceptions in favor of the latter provided for in the Treaties themselves. I fully coincide in the opinion of my colleague that our taxation law is fair and just in the main, although perhaps not without defects in detail, the proper remedy of which belongs as clearly to the Hawaiian legislature as it does to the British Parliament to remedy the much complained of anomalies and inequalities of the Income Tax. By the last clause of the first paragraph of the British and French Treaties, and by the last paragraph of the Second Article of the French Treaty, British, Swedish and French subjects, trading by wholesale or retail, are clearly subjected to the payment of taxes and import duties as much as the Hawaiians themselves.

So also in regard to auctioneers: they are neither wholesale or retail merchants or traders, within the sense of the Second Articles of the British and French Treaties; a British lawyer of high authority characterizes Auctioneers as *mere agents of both parties, and in their character of agents for the sellers, responsible to them for any impropriety, indiscretion or departure from instructions; and as requiring a license from the executive power of the State*. In common parlance no one in London in speaking of the Messrs. Robins, Auctioneers of the Piazza Covent Garden, or of the Messrs. Winstanleys, of Paternoster Row, would name them as merchants or dealers by wholesale or retail.

In short, the duties and responsibilities of auctioneers are in all countries so peculiar that they form a class by themselves, governed like the police, by the special laws of their own States, and not by the provisions of international treaties. Therefore, none of the King's foreign treaties could apply to auctioneers, unless they were specially therein named; and in regard to the law by which any alien could obtain a license, as an auctioneer, not during my own residence in London, for many years, as a

general merchant, and afterwards, can I call to mind one alien who acted as such.

The freedom of commerce provided in the 2d Article of the treaties above referred to is reciprocal, and cannot be construed to the prejudice of Hawaiian subjects as unilateral.

If I rightly understand that part of Mr. Gregg's letter to me which refers to Mr. Waterhouse's complaint of the appraisement of his property subject to taxation, considered in connection with Mr. Pease's letter to him, which he encloses, it would appear that Mr. Waterhouse considers that appraisement as excessive. If so, was it not his own fault in having declined to make a return of his properties valued by himself? As for so humble an individual as myself, my example is of little account; but as a matter of fact, I may state to you that on the 18th instant, I paid, without question, taxes to the amount of \$204 12 cents, representing at 1-4 of one per cent. \$811-644, although I would be glad to accept \$70,000 in cash for the property so appraised. My confidence in the instructions to the Assessors given by the Minister of Finance and in the knowledge and judgment of the Assessors named by him for this district (Mr. Colburn and Mr. Pease) was so great, that as a matter of choice I left them at liberty to appraise everything at their own discretion; and notwithstanding what I say above, I am as far as possible from thinking that they abused my confidence in that respect.

Finally, as the humblest of the King's Ministers, I quote with no small pride the following paragraphs from Mr. Gregg's aforesaid letter:

"There is no country in the world where the alien is received with more cordial welcome than in the Hawaiian Kingdom; no country where his person is more secure or his interests more favored. His rights as an industrious employee, of acquiring property, managing and disposing of it, without restraint, is unlimited. There is no dark-lantern legislation upon his movements, no ungenerous suspicion of his intentions. He may go and come as he pleases, without restraint. The courts are open to his appeals for justice and the law throws around him the shield of its protection."

"It is plain that this generous policy, this confidence and good will, merits a return of friendly support. Upon the principle of gratitude, for important favors, voluntarily conferred, it deserves a full reciprocity of loyalty to Hawaiian interests and to the Hawaiian Government."

"The policy of a Government thus liberal and confiding to the alien, ought not to be met with liberal criticism, with efforts to thwart its purposes and paralyze its exertions for the common good with ill-considered views against its rulers and subjects, on account of race or of physical peculiarity."

So spoke the late Commissioner of the United States to his fellow citizens and to the Hawaiian people, who attended his lecture, after a return of years of experience of the Hawaiian Government, and while preparing to return to his great republic, of which he had given me official notice on several occasions, even from the 23d of October, 1857.

The whole of the correspondence relating to the case of Mr. Waterhouse as the same appears in the *Polynesian*, and others similarly situated, will be published for the information of all concerned.

I am glad to have this occasion to assure you of the great respect and consideration with which I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,  
R. C. WYLLIE,  
W. L. GREEN, Esq., H. B. M.'s Acting  
Commissioner and Consul General.

## THE POLYNESIAN.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1860.

The public mind, or should we say, the public conscience, is troubled with qualms over the future destiny of Hawaiian girls and their present forlorn and perilous condition. It begins to appreciate that whatever sums may be expended for the education of boys is of no avail in raising up future families, unless the girls of the nation have learnt something more than reading and writing, church music and horse-riding, and learnt that something from those of their own sex, who alone are competent to teach them. Quietly, yet instinctively, the public mind is passing judgment on the so much vaunted Hawaiian school system, as insufficient to prepare the youthful minds for the practical duties and conflicts of life, however much it may adorn them with flowers without fragrance, with fruit without flavor. The patronage shown to the girls' schools established by the Sisters of the Sacred Hearts, the interest felt by many in the girls' school just started by Miss Ogden, are evident signs, to those who can judge society deeper than the surface, that the separation of the sexes, during the educational process, is a primary and imperative want, felt indeed, rather than formulated in words, and without which it would be almost impossible to educate the girls into intelligent women, faithful wives and conscientious mothers. This patronage, this interest, this general awakening to the subject of educating the Hawaiian girls is then, let us hope, the beginning of the end of the Hawaiian school system with its mixed schools and profitless labor. For we hold that, whatever the advocates of the system may adduce, yet all their reasons are drawn from countries, conditions of life, social habits, and general intelligence, which as yet, at least, have no analogy in this country; and consequently, a system predicated upon such postulates is ill adapted, if not positively injurious, where they are wanting.

Let us analyze the subject of education a little, examine its premises and note the results.

It is assumed that ignorant masses of people are the vicious masses, and the assumption is based upon the experience of some six thousand years, more or less.

But vicious masses of people are the greatest obstacles to a well ordered society and good government. Hence it becomes a primary duty, based upon the principle of self-preservation, of society and of government to remove the ignorance through which those masses become and are kept vicious.

But ignorance is a word of a wide meaning, and a person needs not necessarily be vicious because he is ignorant of algebra or the globes, for instance, or because he skips a hard word in his Bible or in the newspaper, or signs his mark to a document instead of his name. We mean the absence of any, or of a correct, knowledge of that person's duties in life, as a child, as a parent, as a husband or wife, as a citizen or subject, as a ruler. That is the ignorance to which we refer—an ignorance which civilized communities are continually combatting by private means, by public institutions, or both.

We suppose none will deny that that ignorance exists in a greater degree here, in a country just emerging from barbarism, than it does in others where morality has been known and education practised for centuries, until that knowledge has become part and parcel of the domestic training, a family heirloom from parent to child, each one adding his special experience to the general stock of what constitutes those social and moral duties.

Thus, where the family supplies this instruction, the Government is at liberty, and is expected, to furnish institutions where that auxiliary knowledge may be acquired by all, which may prove good or bad, according to the use that is made of it, but which will assuredly confirm and develop the moral sense of the recipient, if the foundations have been laid in the family. But where they have not been so laid, as in the cases of orphans or vagrants, there are institutions, either sprung from private charities or public funds, where the want of a family is supplied to these waifs of humanity.

Such we believe to be the general premises, and such the particular structure of education in those countries whose systems have been more or less followed as patterns, and contributed to the making up of the Hawaiian school system, which is lauded so loudly, persisted in so inexorably, and defended so bitterly.

Now let us look to Hawaii-*nei*.

We have the structure, the educational edifice of those countries, in all its lofty and imposing proportions, but where are the foundations, the premises, the family training? We are teaching the boys and girls of the country at an astonishing rate to read and write, but where do they learn not to abuse these accomplishments into forging deeds or writing priuient love-letters? In a country so lately redeemed from the grossest sensuality, and where, though the blaze is quenched, the embers are still glowing, we are mixing boys and girls of all ages in the public schools; but have we any reasonable presumption that they receive in their families those lessons and examples of modesty and refinement, or even of outward propriety and reticence, which, acting with the pressure of public opinion, extend their influence over the playground as well as the school-room, abroad as at home? What in other countries, from which we have copied so extensively but so superficially, can be done with comparative impunity, and in some places even may be regarded as a mark of social strength and general refinement, should not have been attempted here until the conditions of its success had been complied with, until the foundations had been laid as deep, as broad and as securely as they were in the pattern.

But if this knowledge of the duties of life in its various relations was not obtainable in the family—and, under the peculiar circumstances and yet unfinished transition of the people, it was not to have been expected—where shall we look for it—from whence should it come?

We will answer that question at once and explain afterwards.

When we use the word church, we do so without reference to any particular denomination, by which the Christian Church may be represented. It is sufficient for our purpose that it is a Christian Church, in a professedly Christian land, teaching practice as well as faith, morals as well as dogmas. If the family fails us in instructing the young in the knowledge and practice of their duties in life, we must perforce fall back on the Church, that is, on the religious element of society, to furnish that moral pulchrum for which the children are starving at home. It never can equal the vividness, the kindness and the duration of the impressions and lessons which the young heart receives at the hearth-stone of home, but it is the next best resource and, under certain conditions of society, the only resource through which to impart not merely the labial repetition, the mechanical remembrance of the duties of life, but the saving appreciation of the divine command that, "whatsoever ye wish that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them;" which command, from whatever source imparted, we look upon as the text-book of life, the best "Manual of Politeness."

The State, that is the Government, is charged with, and responsible that the people receive the necessary instruction to fit them for their duties in life, and for the maintenance of the State. In old, civilized and free countries these things regulate themselves, and the Government exercises simply a general surveillance, and merely comes in to assist with stated appropriations, houses or land, or occasional donations, for there the people themselves impart to their young, in the first instance, that instruction which otherwise the State would be obliged to delegate to others to impart.

Here, however, where that primary medium of instruction, the family, did not exist, in a religious and civilized sense of the word, and for that matter is as yet too feeble to perform its duties,—here the State was obliged to appeal to the religious element, through the pastors and teachers of the various denominations, to furnish that instruction to all, but more particularly to the young in whom the germ of the future State was wrapped up, and on whose morality and intelligence the prosperity of the country, the very existence of its people depended.

The State did so appeal, and the early missionaries nobly responded; and for many years the schools taught ethics as well as rubrics.

But about the year 1840, when the Government organized itself, the schools were remodelled. The missionaries subsequently, with the exception of a few select schools, gradually withdrew from the actual teaching and constant and general supervision of the public schools, which were now entrusted to masters who were seldom more than one degree above their scholars in general intelligence, and whose moral and social standing quite as seldom inspired the respect in their pupils necessary to beget confidence in their teachings.

Though things were not improving under this regime, yet occasionally the religious, the missionary influence, like flashes of a Northern Light, would illumine the moral atmosphere of the school-room; for, as yet, the schools were not secularized, and the catechism and Christian morals were still taught, and the schools, though public, were still in a measure denominational.

At this remodeling of the school-system, the State reserved to itself not only the general supervision and the payment of the teachers, but also the minute and detailed arrangement of the schools, and this reserved right was afterwards entrusted to a Department, called that of "Public Instruction." But, however, instead of putting that Department into commission, and giving it to liberal and enlightened laymen, or to members of each of the leading denominations, it fell then, and has been since, under the sole charge of the clergymen of one denomination only.

Since that time complaints have often been made that that power has been used to the prejudice of the other denominations, in relation to the management of the schools, and on other grounds. Whether those complaints were true, exaggerated or unfounded, is not our purpose to investigate; it is enough that they existed, were it merely as a protest against the Government assuming to regulate the details of that instruction, moral or otherwise, which, in its need, it had appealed to the denominations to impart, seeing that family training was not to be had.

But even the faint influence which the denominations had possessed over the moral and religious

instruction of the children in school, was now about to be withdrawn; and in 1854 the schools were secularized, their denominational character expunged, and religious instruction ceased, by order of the department, to be imparted to the young and tender, who, receiving none at home, needed it most. Yet strange to say, it was advanced at the time, that this change was made "in accordance with the theory of our laws," and in order "that the principle of religious liberty should be fully carried out."

Thus the Government was made to refuse assistance to denominational schools, because its principle of religious liberty would have been compromised, and yet the same department, in almost the same breath, ask the government for, and obtain, an endowment for a college whose radical characteristic was an unyielding sectarianism, and one of whose most prominent and professed objects was Protestant Missionary extension and war against the Catholics.

In subsequent reports we find the department congratulating itself upon the economy effected by the change, and priding itself on the fact that no religious instruction was imparted in the schools, but evidently sacrificing the solid foundation of all instruction for superficial acquirements; goodness for smartness; the Catechism for Colburn's Arithmetic.

Having thus, as briefly as the thing can be done in a newspaper article, referred to that first radical school-coming of the Hawaiian school-system, our space will not permit us to more than allude to the long and bitter neglect in which the school system and that department have left the English language and English education, and to the unfortunate half-measures, by which of late years, at the eleventh hour, they have attempted to compromise two irreconcilable elements, and to support two establishments with means hardly sufficient for one, giving preference however, to the present plausible instead of the future useful.

We have then only to revert to the subject with which we began this article, viz: the separation of the sexes in the schools.

Those, who themselves were brought up without such separation, should not have thought of it when they introduced their school system here as intelligible and not, perhaps, to be wondered at; but that after forty years' experience they should still have been blind to the fact, that the promiscuous schooling of boys and girls was laying the foundation of much irreparable injury in after life, and one of the most prolific causes of marring the effect of any system of schools, however perfect it otherwise might be—that is what we cannot explain to ourselves without compromising our charity, or impugning their characters as teachers and guides. We have read several heart-stirring appeals in the reports of the department upon the educational want of Hawaiian females, but it never seems to have struck that department that one of the very first wants to be provided for was the separation of the sexes and providing them with their own school room, play-ground, ranches of education and teachers of their own sex to impart them. If the department failed to perceive this want, or perceiving, to notice it, the public however is beginning to ask itself the question, what has the educational system done for Hawaiian girls, and, with that axiom in its mouth, that "the character of a people is to be judged by its mothers," it cannot wait for the conviction of the department, but has attempted at its own cost to remedy this want and initiate measures for the separate education of Hawaiian females.

How the government might step in to assist these establishments and encourage the promotion of others, or remodel their whole school system so as to do equal justice to girls and boys, will occupy our attention in a future number. We shall be satisfied if at present we have succeeded in pointing out to the legislators and the heads of the department the imperative need of such a remodeling.

How the government might step in to assist these establishments and encourage the promotion of others, or remodel their whole school system so as to do equal justice to girls and boys, will occupy our attention in a future number. We shall be satisfied if at present we have succeeded in pointing out to the legislators and the heads of the department the imperative need of such a remodeling.

How the government might step in to assist these establishments and encourage the promotion of others, or remodel their whole school system so as to do equal justice to girls and boys, will occupy our attention in a future number. We shall be satisfied if at present we have succeeded in pointing out to the legislators and the heads of the department the imperative need of such a remodeling.

## PAST WEEK.

A correspondent of the *Advertiser*,—whom we believe, from certain intrinsic evidences in the article itself, to be a lady, has produced an essay on "Female Education," specially in reference to Hawaiian females, which we look upon as really superior to anything we have read for a long time in that "mirror of politeness" and pink of newspapers, our contemporary. With arguments, true as the Bible, sound as logic and eloquent as only a sincere and unfeeling conviction of one's duty can make them, it urges the wants and points out the dangers to which Hawaiian women are exposed; and with a courage and tact which we respect and admire, it administers one of the most scathing rebukes to "the gentlemen representatives of a Christian civilization," which, sad to say, is but too true in too many instances.

We may possibly misapprehend some portion of the article, but we would respectfully express our surprise that so sharp an observer and so close a reasoner should attach so much importance to the civilizing influence of dress, and the consequent difficulty of civilizing Hawaiian women, enhanced by the greater cost of their outfit. To be sure, a lady in fig-leaves would not greatly prepossess the beholder in favor of her civilization, but we are far from believing also that the outrageous tyranny of "the fashion" in female dress is at all a reliable criterion of her civilization. How much of a temptation to fall, and stimulus to continue in evil, the Hawaiian woman receives from the perfectly ruinous and exorbitant manner of dressing by the lady-representatives of a Christian civilization," the article does not say, though it certainly is a cause that should not be unheeded by those who write upon "female education."

If dress, modern, fashionable dress, is to be a postulant of Hawaiian female civilization, then God have mercy on the women of this people, and husbands and parents may well say in despair:

"O God! that (dress) should be so dear,  
And flesh and blood so cheap!"

Postal Agency.

We learn from the Post Master General of this Kingdom, A. K. Clark, Esq., that, for reasons of economy and convenience to the department and the public here, he has transferred the Hawaiian Mail Agency in San Francisco from Messrs. Morgan, Stone & Co., of that city, to Messrs. D. C. Waterman & Co., of Honolulu, the owners of the Regular Dispatch Line of Clipper Packets between this place and San Francisco, and whose agents in San Francisco Messrs. McRuer & Merrill, will hereafter attend to the Hawaiian Mail interests in that city. With many thanks to Messrs. Morgan, Stone & Co., for their long and faithful attention to the forwarding of Hawaiian Mails, we are confident that the present arrangement offers advantages which, with the best will possible, the other gentlemen could not have equalled.

Queen's Hospital.

We understand that the premises of Mr. Kapaka on Beretania St., leading out to Kulaokahua, has been purchased by the Trustees of the above institution for \$2000, and that the future Hospital will be there erected.

Sanitary Regulations.

Under the "By Authority" heading, our readers will find the rules adopted by the Board of Health for the cleanliness and sanitary condition of the town. We hope they will be strictly lived up to this time.

Not very "Smart."

In its issue of January 25, the *Advertiser*, the would-be commercial exponent and business register of the place, informs its readers that the U. S. Steamer "Pousetan," is a first class steam frigate, of about the size of the *Merimac*, that was here some fifteen months since and will probably be unable to come inside the harbor; and that, leaving on the 22d of February she may be expected on the first of April.

As the *Advertiser* assumes, in such an off-hand manner, to inform the world in general, and as, by the possibility of an accident, such information may reach the ears of the Naval Department of the United States, or elsewhere, and cause them to furnish similar vessels touching at Honolulu, *en passant*, thereby prejudicing the mercantile interest of the place, therefore we would simply correct its statement by the following counter-facts, without comment:

1. The *Merimac* is a screw steamer, first class, 3,200 tons and 40 guns.
2. The *Pousetan* is a side-wheel steamer, second class, 2,415 tons and 9 guns.
3. The *Susquehanna*, a screw steamer, second class, 2,450 tons and 10 guns, came here a few years ago in 24 days from Japan, although having very severe weather on the passage, and came in and went out of the harbor without the least difficulty. And what she did do, the *Pousetan* can do also. If the latter vessel leaves Japan on the 22d of February, the 16th of March would be nearer the time when she may be expected than the 1st of April.

Burgess' New Billiard Rooms on Fort St.

These new rooms, preparatory to being furnished, were christened on Wednesday evening last by one of those gatherings, rich, full of the congenial elements, which characterized them when held last summer at the Bungalow, and at which the elite of the jocos and companionable of Honolulu Society were assembled, and enjoyed themselves until the orthodox hour of midnight in the dance.

The Billiard room was used for this purpose, and brilliantly lit with gas as it was, and the floor filled with gay couples, reminded us, looking back through the vista of we don't know how many years, of the assembly halls of other countries. The rooms up stairs were used by the gentlemen for refreshments, and here were gathered those who thought they could enjoy their time better than in dancing to the gayest measures, in the pursuit of those quaint volumes of mysterious lore, "papers" as full of racy "spots" and unreliable generalities as the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. The rooms were just enough crowded to be pleasant, and could that Turkish Ambassador who remarked, when seeing dancing for the first time, "that he wondered the *hosses* did not let their servants do such work," have been at this assembly, instead of such a comment, he would have thrown off his fez, brushed his moustache, muttered "Allah his mullah, God is great, Mahomet is his prophet—his destiny,"—obtained an introduction to one of the ladies and "gone in" for a Polka, Schottische or the Lancers.

We hope Mr. Burgess will be as fortunate in the success of his new rooms in their future business, as is that of the assembly on the inceptive night, and such cannot fail to be the result, from his former well known popularity and good management in this business.

Friendship's Token.

Our readers doubtless remember the ceremonies performed at the laying of the corner stone of the Old Fellows' Hall, in Fort Street, last spring, and that the Rev. E. Corwin at the request of the order, preached a sermon on the occasion, which was published in our supplement to the *Polynesian*, April 30, 1859. "Cast thy bread upon the waters," said "the Preacher," "for thou shalt find it after many days," and though probably